

on the iris 56, and is reflected therefrom as indicated by 55D, and then is again refracted by the cornea to provide an exit beam 55C which is essentially collinear with the probe beam 55A. See page 35, line 17 to page 38, line 1 of the specification. This technique produces the important advantages described in the specification with reference to Fig. 8C, so as to provide a strong detected output signal level 95 representative of the glucose concentration in the cornea.

The Cote et al. reference clearly contains no disclosure of the iris or of a beam entering the cornea 54, being refracted to and reflected from a spot, such as a spot on an iris, back to the cornea, and/or being refracted so that the exit beam is collinear with the entering beam.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that nothing in the Cote et al. reference discloses or suggests the limitations of step (b) of Claim 1. Furthermore, none of the other references of record provide any disclosure of the iris of an eye or any suggestion of any possible advantage to introducing a beam into the anterior chamber such that it is refracted within the anterior chamber, impinges on the iris, is reflected therefrom, and then exits the anterior chamber approximately collinear with the beam immediately before the point at which it is introduced into the anterior chamber.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the invention of Claim 1 and its dependant Claims 2-5 over the Cote et al. reference in view of the combined teachings of the Pezzaniti et al. reference and the Kuhls reference.

Independent Claims 6 and 18 contain limitations similar to the above discussed limitations of step (b) of Claim 1, so it is respectfully submitted that the above arguments are equally applicable to Claims 6 and 18 and their respective dependent claims 7-17 and 19-26.

Step (d) of Claim 27 recites:

"simultaneously applying a DC signal and an AC signal to the polarization modulator to extinguish any light passing from the analyzer to the detector, by shifting the DC signal to a value that produces a null in the AC component of an output signal produced by the detector".

It is respectfully submitted that the foregoing feature of Claim 27 clearly is not disclosed or suggested by the Cote et al. reference. The applicant has reviewed the cited secondary references and believes that one of them contain any disclosure which would have made obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide step (d) of Claim 27 in combination with steps (a)-(c). Although the Kuhl reference and Buchert reference referred to use of tool modulation, these references are directed, respectively, to systems using complex multipass systems and to systems using a differential absorption technology which are structurally very different from the optical glucose measurement system of the present invention. Furthermore, the Kuhl reference and the Buchert reference are not directed to assaulting the same noise problems faced by the present inventor before he made the present invention.

Essentially the same argument is applicable to element (g) of Claim 38.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 27 and its dependent Claims 28-35, and Claim 38 and its dependent Claims 39-43, would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill

Received: 1/3/01 11:40AM

520 443 0570 -> CAHILL SUTTON; Page 5

JAN-03-2001 11:31 AM CHARLES HOFFMAN

520 443 0570

P.05

Sent by: CAHILL BUTTON

0020584208;

01/03/01 11:08AM; JEFF #844; Page 5/5

in the art in view of the teachings of the Cote et al. reference in view of the teachings of the cited secondary references.

In view of the above amendments and arguments, is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

CAHILL, SUTTON & THOMAS P.L.C.



Charles R. Hoffman
Registration No. 26,556

2141 East Highland Avenue
155 Park One
Phoenix, Arizona 85016
(602) 956-7000
Docket No. 5899-A-01